



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

SHAWNETA SALLEY-DAVIS, §  
Plaintiff, §  
§  
vs. § CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:10-01411-HFF-TER  
§  
COMMISSIONER OF THE SOCIAL §  
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, §  
Defendant. §

---

ORDER

---

This case was filed as a social security disability benefits action. Plaintiff is represented by counsel. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that Defendant's decision be reversed pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and that the case be remanded to Defendant for further administrative action. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on June 30, 2011. Defendant filed a notice on July 18, 2011, stating that he would not file any objections to the Report. Plaintiff did not file any objections to the Report. In the absence of such objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court that Defendant's decision is **REVERSED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and that the case is **REMANDED** to Defendant for further administrative action.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 21st day of July, 2011, in Spartanburg, South Carolina.

s/ Henry F. Floyd  
HENRY F. FLOYD  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE